

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of November 3, 2005.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

Claims 1-5 and 8-19 remain in this application. Claims 6 and 7 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 5, 8-12 and 17-19 have been amended.

Claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable over the cited art. In particular, claim 1 recites a first printing section, a second printing section, and a gloss enhancing station disposed downstream of the second fusing assembly. The cited references do not teach or suggest the claimed features. A brief summary of the exemplary embodiment may be helpful here. Many xerographic machines have been designed to produce only black and white or highlight color copies. However, in order to produce full process color copies, certain modifications are needed. Thus, there is a need for an apparatus and method for producing high speed full process color images while keeping costs down and maintaining the architectural and footprint integrity of the main printing platform, which is generally designed to print black and white and HLC images.

To that end, the present application sets forth a system incorporating a smaller fuser such as that used for monochrome or highlight color (primary printing station), which is part of a base architecture. This primary fusing station 14 partially fuses a full color image on the copy sheet to a level such that the sheet can be transported around the duplex path and registration elements. Thus, primary fusing station 14 is generally limited to producing finished black and white or highlight color images or partially finished full color images. The sheet is then transported to a secondary fusing station 16 for completing the fusing process. A gloss enhancing station 122 is positioned downstream in a process direction for selectively enhancing the gloss properties of the sheet. Thus, there are three stages to the production of a color document.

The primary reference, Funato, discloses an image forming apparatus 10 including an image forming unit 11 capable of forming full color images and a fixing unit 12, which is coupled to the image forming unit 11 (column 6, lines 25-28). The image forming unit includes a primary fixing device 251, while the secondary fixing device 252 is disposed in the downstream of the primary fixing device 251 and is contained within the fixing unit 12. The primary fixing device 251 is capable of producing a final, full color image (as opposed

to only a partially fused full color image), as explained in column 12, line 3 to column 13, line 5. The purpose of the secondary fixing device 252 is to produce a high quality image (i.e., to add "gloss"). This is in direct contrast to the system described in claim 1, which includes a primary fusing device to partially fuse a color image, a secondary fusing device to finalize the full color image, and then a third fusing station for producing a high quality (i.e., glossy) image.

The secondary reference, Chen, discloses apparatus and methods to adjust gloss of a fused toner image. Chen discloses using a fusing system 4 and a finishing system 5, which is used to adjust gloss on the photo (see col. 5, lines 25-28). However, Chen fails to teach or suggest the concepts of partial and final fusing of full color images along with adding gloss at a third stage in the process. As such, Chen fails to overcome the deficiencies of Funato.

For the foregoing reasons, even if Funato's apparatus were modified as proposed by the Examiner in view of the teachings of Chen, this would still not result in appellant's claimed invention. It is elementary that to support an obviousness rejection, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art applied. See MPEP 2143.01. Thus, the rejection of claim 1, or claims 2-11, which depend therefrom, should be reversed.

Claim 12, as amended, and claims 13-16, which depend therefrom, and claim 17, as amended, and claims 18 and 19, which depend therefrom, are similarly patentable in view of the cited art.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons detailed above, it is submitted that all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-5 and 8-19) are in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this Amendment A. However, the undersigned attorney of record hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call John S. Zanghi, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

2/3/06
Date



John S. Zanghi
Reg. No. 48,843
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582

N:\XERZ200657\EMC0003867V001.DOC